DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 169 FL 009 132

AUTHOR McConnell, Grant
TITLE Language Treatment and Language Planning in Canada. Part 2: The Provinces. Language Planning Newsletter, Vol. 3, No. 4.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. East-West Center.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 7p.; Some parts may be marginally legible due to print quality
AVAILABLE FROM Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 (free)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingualism; English; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *French; *Language Planning; Language Standardization; Language Styles; Language Usage; Language Variation; Literacy; Minority Groups; *National Programs; *Official Languages; Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; *Quebec

ABSTRACT

As stated in Part 1 of this discussion, Canada is a hybrid, making use of both the macro, or policy, model and the micro, or cultivation, model of language treatment. Some concrete measures are taking place in language status and corpus planning on the inter-federal-provincial level and the provincial level, particularly in Quebec. One such measure is the creation of the Language Programs Branch of the Secretary of State, whose function it is to promote the acquisition and use of French and English. This policy, however, has failed to strengthen French-speaking minority groups. The Quebec government's measures include the passing of Bill 63, promulgating the equality of English and French, Bill 22, declaring French the official language of Quebec, and, in 1977, Bill 101, which attempted to further reduce the use of English in Quebec. Language corpus planning, unlike status planning, is in the implementation stage in Quebec. But it must be concluded that the different language policies have not been carried out in a rigorous manner, and that the language planning conflict is yet to be resolved. (AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

EAST-WEST CENTER
Honolulu, Hawaii

Language Planning Newsletter

EAST-WEST CULTURE LEARNING INSTITUTE NOVEMBER 1977 VOL. 3 NO. 4

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan Rubin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Language Treatment and Language Planning in Canada

Part II: The Provinces

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED148169

FL009132

Grant McConnell*

If language planning requires first and foremost a recognition of language problems (and often behind them political problems), then it is probably true to say that in Canada we have only very slowly and somewhat reluctantly become involved in full-blown, fully recognized language planning and that initially we were involved only half-heartedly in the undertaking. Also, language planning, although it was perhaps not recognized nominally as such, was treated in an *ad hoc* piecemeal fashion. Many would contend that the level of *treatment* of language problems is no more rigorous today, as it springs largely from political problems and options that are resolved through a complex struggle among politicians and governments in search of power. Some have emphatically claimed that language problems are only a corollary to a central power and political struggle. Although this view of reality may hold some truth, power factions are usually composed of closely knit groups having a common purpose(s) and holding a common view(s) — on the world, on the state, on the national community, on economic policy and on language policy. Now the linguo-political view both in Canada and in other countries, has a strong polarizing and magnetizing effect that influences, rearranges and restructures the political forces at work. It can also be a strong catalyzing force that brings direction and meaning to political struggle.

As stated in Part I of this discussion on Canadian language planning, from the point of view of *policy* (macro) and *cultivation* (micro) treatment patterns, Canada is a hybrid case making use of elements in both of these formal models. On the level of the polity there is a clear *status* problem touching on the choice of national and official languages and on allocation of language use. On the level of the language (code) there is a problem of *corpus* development which is probably the less politically viable of the two. We will examine below some concrete planning measures that have and are taking place in status and corpus planning on (1) the inter federal-provincial level and (2) on the provincial level — particularly in Quebec.

*The author is co-director of Sociolinguistic publications at the Centre International de Recherche sur le Bilinguisme (CIRB), Quebec City.

Federal and Provincial Realities

The *status* problem that has been evoked is one of the equality (or eventual equality) of the two official languages on the pan-Canadian level. English and French were declared equal on the Federal level in the Official Languages Act of 1968, but it was quite another task to bring this equality into reality on a day-to-day basis. All provinces were of majority English mother tongue, except Quebec, which had an important (both numerically and economically) English speaking minority which far out distanced the numerically and economically weaker French mother tongue minority groups in other provinces. Table 1 compares the 1971 and 1976 mother tongue data by province and for Canada as a whole, for both languages. There is a slight drop in the absolute number of French mother tongue claimants for most provinces and for Canada as a whole, for both languages. There is a slight drop in the absolute number of French mother tongue claimants for most provinces but a slight increase in Quebec, New Brunswick and British Columbia. However, as a percentage of the total population, there is a decrease in French mother tongue claimants in all cases.

A similar drop was recorded for other ethnic groups and their mother tongues, for all provinces, even when these 'other mother tongues' were numerically stronger than the French mother tongue group. Although the losses were slight, the results are hardly encouraging for those interested in minority language maintenance and viability and, in particular for the viability of the French language outside Quebec. Assimilation studies (Castonguay, 1974) have indicated that the French language communities are assimilating as rapidly as other ethnic groups, in spite of the particular attention they have been given by Federal and in some cases by Provincial governments. The rate of

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 1*
Population by Mother Tongue: Census 1971 & 1976

	1971 ENGLISH	%	1976 ENGLISH	%	1971 FRENCH	%	1976 FRENCH	%
CANADA	*12,973,810*	*(60.2)*	*14,043,250*	*(61.1)*	*5,793,650*	*(26.9)*	*5,865,365*	*(25.5)*
Newfoundland	514,515	(98.5)	540,895	(97.0)	3,535	(0.7)	2,730	(0.5)
P.E. Island	103,100	(92.4)	109,190	(92.4)	7,360	(6.6)	6,500	(5.5)
Nova Scotia	733,555	(93.0)	763,075	(92.1)	39,335	(5.0)	36,620	(4.4)
New Brunswick	410,400	(64.7)	434,035	(64.1)	215,725	(34.0)	222,710	(32.9)
Quebec	789,185	(13.1)	798,460	(12.8)	4,867,250	(80.7)	4,972,090	(79.8)
Ontario	5,971,570	(77.5)	6,431,040	(77.8)	482,040	(6.3)	460,075	(5.6)
Manitoba	662,725	(67.1)	722,715	(70.7)	60,550	(6.1)	54,390	(5.3)
Saskatchewan	685,920	(74.1)	710,375	(77.1)	31,605	(3.4)	26,500	(2.9)
Alberta	1,263,932	(77.6)	1,470,190	(80.0)	46,495	(2.9)	44,025	(2.4)
B.C.	1,807,250	(82.7)	2,021,645	(82.0)	38,035	(1.7)	38,110	(1.5)
Yukon	15,345	(83.5)	18,685	(85.6)	450	(2.4)	520	(2.4)
N.W.T.	16,305	(46.9)	22,890	(53.7)	1,165	(3.3)	1,080	(2.5)

**The two censuses are not strictly comparable because of a difference in the method of distribution of those (1) declaring 2 mother tongues and (2) not declaring any mother tongue.*

assimilation[1] in the Anglophone provinces to the majority community and language, according to the 1971 census, was as follows: New Brunswick 7.7%, Ontario 26.9%, Nova Scotia 30.8%, Manitoba 34.6%, Newfoundland 37.0%, Prince Edward Island 40.0%, Saskatchewan 49.6%, Alberta 51.7%, British Columbia 69.7%.

Although the Federal government in its Official Languages Act proposed the setting up of bilingual districts based on numerical strength of the Francophone population (roughly 10%), this part of the act was never carried out. Did the Francophone communities really want these districts? Would they really reinforce the French communities as they were intended to do? How would other minority groups within the districts view the preference given to the French group? Would the bilingual district be accepted by the Anglophone majority in each province? These were just some of the questions raised by governments at both levels, as well as by those commissioned to study the question of bilingual districts. The answers to these questions seemed to be largely negative. Such districts could hardly be viable, operating only at the Federal level, i.e. in Federal institutions. They would require reinforcement on the provincial level as well and the Provincial governments hardly seemed inclined to follow the Federal lead.

Because the demographic and geolinguistic features of the provinces varied so greatly from each other and because the numerical and political force of the French community was mainly concentrated at one end of the country and in Quebec in particular, there was little or no common viewpoint on language planning and on how status problems should be treated, let alone what the desired outcome should be. The policy of two official languages often did not seem to fit the provincial reality as viewed by the average person. Also the average person failed to see the symbolical and political importance of such a gesture, as it affected him so little in his everyday life.

A Federal-Provincial Liaison

Not only is the Federal Government concerned with the language of work and the language offered to the public at large, it has also created an important link with the provincial governments through the Secretary of State, Language Programs Branch. The overall objective of this Branch is 'to promote, facilitate and encourage the acquisition and use of the two official languages in Canadian society' by grants-in-aid to programs in (1) Education (2) Public Administration (3) Language Acquisition Development and (4) The Private Sector. The programs support (1) the official minority language groups and their culture and (2) the second official language and its culture. For such purposes, the official minority language group is French in all provinces except Quebec, where it is English. The same stands for the second official language and its culture. This would be the study of the minority language

[1] *This was calculated in the following way:*

$$\frac{\textit{Mother Tongue-Home Language}}{\textit{Mother Tongue}}$$

Editor — Joan Rubin
Associate Editor — Björn Jernudd
Editorial Board
M.H. Abdulaziz
Joshua Fishman
Bertil Molde
Monsur Musa
Jiří Neustupný

Copies are available free of charge. Changes of address and requests to be placed on the mailing list should be addressed to:

William Feltz
East-West Culture Learning Institute
East-West Center
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848

All other correspondence should be addressed to the editor:

Dr. Joan Rubin
Dept. of Anthropology
California State University
Northridge, California 91330

French in the nine English speaking provinces and English in Quebec.

Financial support to education is a particularly delicate but highly important area. Education is entirely under provincial jurisdiction, so the Secretary of State can only give aid to programs already available or consented to by the provinces.

Elementary and secondary education is financed on a per capita basis of 9% of the overall annual costs of educating a student in the official *minority language* and 5% of the overall annual costs of educating a student in the *second official language*. Some 1.5% of administrative costs incurred by the former group are also covered, based on the total pupil enrollment. For post-secondary education of the official minority language, including bilingual institutions, grants cover about 10% of operating cost including capital expenditures. The combined contributions of the above, amounted to $49,950,000. for the fiscal year 1970-71 and $98,154,292. for the fiscal year 1975-76. Quebec received the lion's share of this amount, nearly $58 million in 1975-76, due to its large number of pupils in both the official minority and second official language groups. Ontario followed with $27 million and New Brunswick with $6 million. All other provinces were below $2 million. The cumulative national total of grants and monies for the period 1970-76 represented an outlay of $430 million.

Although the above formula payments represent an important financial part of the aid available, important sums of money were also spent on the following programs (1) Fellowships for Official Language Study, (2) Bursaries for Teachers, (3) Travel Bursaries for Minority Language Students, (4) Summer Language Bursary Program, (5) Second Language Monitor Program, (6) Special Projects in Minority and Second Language Teaching Methods, (7) Language Training Centers, (8) Teachers' Colleges.

As mentioned above, aid is available in other areas than education, namely support to official minority group cultural activities as well as to voluntary associations, industry and consumer affairs.

All of the above is meant to reinforce the equality of status of the two official languages throughout the country and represents for language planning, support for *implementation* and coordination, that are a result of previous policy decisions. However, as with policies touching on language allocation within Federal government structures, policies regarding education and cultural matters carried out by the Language Programs Branch of the Secretary of State, are probably also due for a period of stock taking and *evaluation*. Of course, the responsibility toward the official minority groups cannot lie entirely with the Federal government. It is certainly a joint federal-provincial matter and in the area of education responsibility lies heavily with the provincial governments. The latest political events have put the center of attention on the official minority language groups, their lack of solidly entrenched rights for an education in the minority language, and in fact the complete or partial lack of an educational system from the elementary to the post-secondary level.[2]

[2]*Quebec and New Brunswick are the only provinces offering a complete education in both official languages.*

The Provincial Stigma

In a new era of reevaluation the onus is now on the English provinces to provide a complete system of education for their official French minority groups, where numbers warrant such action. The question in point is the very viability of these groups. In spite of doubts that an educational system alone can support a minority group, it still seems to be a minimal condition around which other supports such as radio, T.V. and cultural organized groups and institutions can be built. However, the viability of these minority language groups are not yet secured (and perhaps never will be) but their disappearance will all the same have dramatic political repercussions throughout the country. The enrollment data indicated in Table 1 above is not very positive and would be still less so, if data were also available in 1976 for 'language spoken in the home.' Further evidence of the stagnation and present difficulties of these groups is shown in the table below concerning education. Table 2 gives the total school enrollment for the 9 English provinces in minority (French) language education for 1970-1971 and 1976-1977.

One must conclude that there has been little or no overall increase in French education enrollment, in spite of the period of time involved (7 years) and in spite of the fact that massive amounts of money have been spent by the Federal government in its aid program through the Language Programs Branch. This is not to denigrate the help that was given but simply to point out that its effect has been minimal. The present situation is perhaps best typified by the 'Federation des Francophones Hors Quebec,' in its two volume report (1977), in which they speak of the French communities outside of

TABLE 2*
Enrollment in Minority (French) Language Education in the Anglophone Provinces

Province	1970-71	1976-77	% change
Newfoundland	185	256	38.38
Prince Edward Island	796	988	24.12
Nova Scotia	7,388	5,587	- 24.38
New Brunswick	60,679	56,182	- 7.41
Ontario	111,455	118,394	6.23
Manitoba	10,828	9,833	- 8.82
Saskatchewan	765	1,693	121.31
Alberta	N.D.	8,993	
British Columbia	N.D.	839	
TOTAL 9 provinces	192,096	202,765	5.55

Quebec as being in a state of 'crisis' and 'decay.' Many uphold that it is simply too late and that the demise of these communities is inevitable. Nor has this been caused by bureaucratic mismanagement and bungling. Rather, it is largely because powerful economic and social forces are at work breaking down the isolation of these communities that formerly were able to survive with local parish and church organizations. The social and moral authority of the church has greatly diminished and there is an exodus to the urban areas, where the language of work and daily life for these groups is becoming or already has become English.

(Continued on next page)

**The table excludes all Anglophone pupils, including those in total immersion French programs.*

The institutional bilingualism written into the Official Languages Act, simply cannot sustain the viability of French communities outside Quebec. The failure of the above policy to effectively solidify and strengthen these groups, can also partly be found in the lack of encouragement on the part of most provincial governments. Whether a renewed interest in these groups, even on the part of the provincial governments (as we now seem to be witnessing) can have any lasting or remedial effect, is certainly open to question.

Quebec — Language Planning and Policy

If the Federal government began its formal language planning about the time of the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission in 1969, the Quebec government also began formulating its language policy in the same year, by passing into law Bill 63.[3] This was followed by Bill 22, which came into law in 1974 and finally Bill 1, (or later Bill 101) which became law in August 1977. The first two bills were followed by the defeat of the government that passed them and each in turn, was scrapped for a new formulation of the language law. All three bills tried to legislate the allocation or reallocation of the French language and represented attempts to upgrade its status and to put an end to the functionally *diglossic* situation, that had long been an historically established fact in Quebec, with English as high (H) and French as low (L) language.[4] This naturally implied a reallocation for English as well, and further meant taking a stand on the bilingual nature of the province. The change in attitude, both towards English and toward bilingualism, can be seen in each succeeding law, particularly insofar as it affected (1) the choice of an official language and (2) the choice of the language of instruction at school, (3) the choice of the language of work.

Language Allocation

Step 1

Bill 63 promulgated the equality of both English and French. No official language for the province had yet been chosen. The education policy was an 'open' or free-choice one for all, with *some* emphasis on French. The bill foresaw, for example, the setting up of the French Language Bureau (L'Office de la langue française) in Article 4 (Section 14 and 14a of the Cultural Affaires Department Act), whose duties were to:

14. (b) advise the government . . . to see to it that French is the *working language* in public and private undertakings (institutions) in Quebec;
    (c) in cooperation with such undertakings (business firms), prepare programs to see to it that the French language is the working language . . . of . . . their administrators and employees;
    (d) advise the government . . . in regard to public posting (signs) to ensure the *priority* of the French language therein;
    (e) establish a linguistic research center to coordinate all research activities . . . ;

14a. . . . hear any *complaint* by any employee or group of employees to the effect that his or their right to use the French language as the working language is not respected.

In actual fact, the Bureau had a relatively small budget, a handful of employees and limited authority in carrying out its duties; i.e. it had no particular power to see that *priority*, in fact, be given to French, nor was the Act coercive in any way. The articles were, however, a sign of the times and represented in embryonic form a preview of what was to follow.

Step 2

Bill 22, which supplanted the earlier Bill 63 declared in TITLE I:

> French is the official language of the Province of Quebec.

The policy was now one of the primacy of French or *primus inter pares*. French was to be reallocated to an (H) language or a front seat position but English was to have its place alongside French. Although the province was not officially bilingual, it was still partly so functionally, not in the governmental or para-governmental sphere but rather in the private corporate sphere, and also to some extent in public life. The education policy was still 'open' but less so, that is, it was conditional upon knowledge (competence) in the media of instruction. The burden of the proof was on the English media school, which contained the largest percentage of pupils of 'other ethnic' origins and 'other than English' mother tongues. All those whose knowledge of English was in doubt, were required to pass a language test. Immigrant children whose knowledge of both English and French was limited, were required to opt for the French school system. The main aim of such measures was to stop the flow of pupils of low English competence into English media schools, and integrate them into the French school system.

Although the testing measures seem scientific enough and therefore reasonable, they created much discontentment. There was distrust of the application of the tests and bitterness from those that failed. Immigrant groups still wanted a completely free choice irregardless of competence (or bilingual schools which did not exist) and the English language community was unhappy with the perspective of losing new recruits. That part of the French community which advocated stricter measures in education and a 'closed' (no-choice) or unilingual French policy, saw the rules as too liberal and unworkable. Unworkable they seemed to be, given the prevailing opinions and general social climate.

Most of the other points in Bill 63 were taken up again in Bill 22, which was expanded from 5 to 123 sections, under five main titles and nine chapters in all. Bill 22 strengthened and amplified the powers of the Office, which was renamed the Regie de la langue francaise[5] and was now headed by an executive body of nine members including the president and two vice-presidents. The role of the Regie, which by 1977 had grown to over 230 employees in seven[6] departments, was to act as the new watchdog in all matters relating to status and corpus planning of the French language. This included the authority to carry out investigations to see whether the Act was being respected (Chapter III) as well as the duty to issue certificates of 'Francization' (Articles 57, 58) which would eventually require

[3]Bill 63 had a forerunner, Bill 85, which never became law.

[4]This was not strictly true in all cases, but was particularly evident in the economic and corporate spheres.

[5]Under Bill 101, it has again returned to its former name of 'Office de la langue française.'

[6](1) Investigation, (2) Francization, (3) Management, (4) Research and Evaluation, (5) Public Relations, (6) Secretariat, (7) Terminology.

business firms to work in French. The Regie was also responsible for the other 'programs' outlined in the Act namely (1) labelling, (2) public signs and written advertisements, (3) issuing of permits to individuals in professional corporations etc. All this was to be carried out in a step-by-step fashion from 1976 to 1983.

Although this was backed up by a program of publicity through the spoken and written media to help sell the changes envisaged in the Act and some progress was reported in the programs of (1) labelling, (2) public signs and even (3) the francization of business firms, phase I of the latter program was only to begin in 1977. It was at this time, however, that all implementation stopped, due to a change in government (November 1976) and the announcement of a new language bill.

Bill 22 was based on a serious and broad study enquiring into the status of the French language and linguistic rights, known as the Commission Gendron 1968-1972 (1972). Concerning the language of work, which was considered a question of primordial importance, the Commission concluded that 63% of all Anglophones and 64% of all Francophones worked almost exclusively in their respective languages. Some 32% of both groups worked in both languages. Allophones' worked most in both languages 40%, and least of all in French 14%, as opposed to English 36%. This seemed to point to a less serious situation than was often claimed for the Francophone worker; however most agreed that some remedial action had to be taken to strengthen French. There were, nevertheless, varying opinions as to how serious the situation really was and the results of the Gendron Commission hardly settled the question. Many felt that Bill 22, other than that part concerned with the language of instruction (TITLE III, Chapter V) was sufficiently rigorous and that the psychology of persuasion and encouragement for the promotion of the French language was the most effective one to use. In point of fact, it is difficult to prove either way, because this legislation remained law for only 3 years and in that short period of time, as we have seen, most sections of the law had not yet been applied and a few had only begun to take effect.

Step 3

The latest language bill 101 became law in August 1977. It represents an abrupt change from the *primus inter pares* stand of Bill 22 to one emphasizing the exclusivity of French. French is to remain, of course, the official language of Quebec, but English no longer has a prominent place alongside French. A unilingual language policy had been invoked, and Quebec has finally become a province 'comme les autres' on matters of language legislation. The English provinces, other than New Brunswick, had long since backed off from a declared official bilingual policy. Now Quebec was doing the same thing. The aim of the above legislation was to reduce functional bilingualism in the private corporate sphere as well as in public life, by replacing the presence of the English language by French.

An English media education was limited to the core English language group, i.e. those pupils whose parents (at least one) had been educated in an English media primary school, and who were present in Quebec when the law was passed. They were, of course, also free to opt for a French language education if they so chose. Those immigrant children who were already legally enrolled in an English school before the law was passed, could continue to be so enrolled as could their younger brothers and sisters. All new immigrants (including those of English mother tongue) would be required to go to French media schools. All Canadian citizens from other provinces would also be required to attend the French schools (Quebec clause). There was some hesitancy and much discussion concerning the above clause, which was countered by a proposed open policy clause for Canadians from other provinces (Canada clause). This was not included in the law, although room was left for possible joint special agreements with other provinces.

Apart from the section on education and the language of instruction in the schools, which is under the authority of the Minister of Education, the application of law 101 is under the control of three agencies of largely unequal authority. These are the (1) Office de la langue française, the (2) Commission de Surveillance (Investigation Committee) and (3) Conseil de la langue française. The latter has the least powerful role and can be used by the Minister of Cultural Development directly for consultative purposes. It does not have the power to undertake investigation on its own. The Commission de Surveillance, on the other hand, has the difficult task of policing the language act, that is, it must deal with all questions concerning those corporate persons or individuals who break the law concerning the Act, and who are now liable to fines. Finally, the Office de la langue française, has kept its place as the general coordinator of all of the above. It must tend to the general application of the law, define the rules by which all its programs, including francization, will run, classify all business firms and finally judge whether or not they qualify for a certificate.

The overall approach, policy and philosophy of the present law is different from the previous one. It is certainly more coercive, in that it represents a piece of legislation that promotes French but demotes English. It has put into question the continuing use of English in the corporate and private business world and also in public life. The policy, as promulgated by the bill, is clearly a unilingual one and implicit in this policy is the belief that (1) French must be dominant, (2) English and French cannot compatibly live side by side, (3) in order for French to dominate, English must be removed from its present domains of use. The English community's basic rights in Quebec are no more guaranteed than the French communities' rights in the other provinces.

Language Corpus Planning

Although *status* planning remains by far the most important and politically conscious type of language planning, *corpus* planning has always had its place in all of Quebec's language bills, where it has always remained an important part of the activities and responsibilities of the Office de la langue francaise.

Bill 63 (Article 14)

(a) foster the correction and enrichment of the spoken

(Continued on next page)

'A term used to represent those of other mother tongues than English or French. (Gr. ALLO-, from ALLOS "other").

and written language.

Bill 22 (Article 55)
- (b) to see to the correction and enrichment of the spoken and written language.
- (i) to standardize the use of vocabulary in the province of Quebec and to approve the expressions and terms recommended by the terminology committees.

Bill 101 (Article 75)
- (a) to see to the correction and enrichment of the spoken and written language
- (b) to see to the evolution of the language situation in Quebec as to the status and *quality* of the French language
- (e) to define and carry out in Quebec a policy concerning matters of terminology and linguistic research
- (f) fulfill the role of language standardization according to the present law and approve the expressions and terms recommended by the terminology committees.

As seen in the above mentioned articles of the bills, there has been a continuity not only in the wording but in the spirit in which corpus planning has and is being carried out. Corpus planning has therefore had much more opportunity in Quebec to get beyond the stage of policy planning and enter into the phase of implementation. Corpus planning has had more continuity and consistency, probably because it is less exposed to the vagaries of the political arena and the applied sociology of language, i.e. who speaks what, where and why?

Thus from the very earliest bill[a] up to the present time, the 'Office' has built up a bank of specialized terms and has expanded and modernized its services through its computerized terminology and reference source banks, that are to be available to government, business, industry and eventually the general public. The terminology section is located in Quebec City with one section (Language Consultation Service) concentrating on services to business, located in Montreal.

The Office over the past few years has, in cooperation with industry and business, held a number of workshops in order to help the corporate world deal with updating and creating new terms for the North American technological setting. Since 1972, yearly international meetings of experts have also been held by the Office to discuss both theoretical and practical implications in the field of terminology. Finally, the terminology bank itself is to act as a sort of clearing house, or center of an information network, where data will be gathered from all sources, classified for easy use, and made available to interested customers, principally within government departments and in business and industry.

All in all, language corpus planning, unlike language status planning in Quebec, seems to be advancing nicely beyond the stage of policy planning and is already into the second or implementation stage. It remains to be seen, however, whether these implementation and coordination activities will bear up to a later evaluation, in the light of a readily available and readily used terminology.

Conclusions

In order to see the above in a just perspective, it should be noted that (1) Quebec is the only one of the 10 provinces in which the French language is numerically the strongest, (2) the Quebec birth rate is now the lowest in the country and the French population by mother tongue now represents only 25% of the total population, (3) the English-speaking community of Quebec has up until the present time been the strongest and most influential of any minority official language community in the country, (4) French language communities outside Quebec are far less influential and generally have not enjoyed the same rights and privileges as the English community in Quebec, (5) immigrants to Quebec have, more often than not, become assimilated to the minority English-speaking community rather than to the French majority community. All this gives cause and has given cause for serious reflection and language reform in Quebec.

Language planning and language policy has now become part and parcel of life in Canada. Due to the present federal structure and the geopolitical variation in the country, there cannot be one language planning agency nor only one language policy. Nor has execution, coordination and evaluation of the different policies been carried out in a very rigorous manner. There has been much changing, backtracking and experimentation and always behind the language planning, political forces and options are at work. One should perhaps speak of language planning in conflict and exactly how the conflict will be resolved in terms of final solutions to language problems, largely remains an open question.

Selected Bibliography

Castonguay, Charles, *Dimensions des transferts linguistiques entre groups anglophones, francophones et autres d'après le recensement de 1971.* Annales de l'Association canadienne-française pour l'avancement des sciences (ACFAS), vol. 41, no. 2, 1974.

F.F.H.Q. (La Fédération des Francophones Hors Québec), 1977. *Les héritiers de Lord Durham.* Vol. 1 and 2.

Gendron, Jean-Denis (1972), Rapport de la Commission d'enquête sur la situation de la langue française et sur les droits linguistiques au Québec, *La situation de la langue francaise au Quebec.* Three basic reports: I- La langue du travail; II- Les droits linguistiques; III- Les groupes ethniques.

Useful Addresses

1. La Fédération des Francophones Hors Québec
   1401 - 1 rue Nicholas
   Ottawa (Ontario) K1N 7B6
2. Office de la langue française
   700 boul. St-Cyrille Est
   Québec (Québec) G1R 5A9
3. Office de la langue française
   800 Place Victoria
   Montréal (Québec) H4Z 1G8

[a] *The Terminology Center was first established in March 1969.*

THE EAST-WEST CENTER is a national educational institution established in Hawaii by the U.S. Congress in 1960 to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research. Each year more than 1,500 men and women from the many nations and cultures work together in problem-oriented institutes or on "open" grants as they seek solutions to problems of mutual consequence to East and West. For each Center participant from the United States, two participants are sought from the Asian and Pacific area. The U.S. Congress provides basic funding for programs and a variety of awards, and the Center is administered by a public, nonprofit corporation with an international Board of Governors.

1777 East-West Road, Honolulu, Hawaii 96848